

NAC-0020\_R1

# FEP Analysis for Disposal of Depleted Uranium at the Clive Facility

5 June 2014~~28 May 2014~~



Prepared by  
NEPTUNE AND COMPANY, INC.  
1505 15<sup>th</sup> St, Suite B, Los Alamos, NM 87544

*FEP Analysis for Disposal of Depleted Uranium at the Clive Facility*

---

1. Title: FEP Analysis for Disposal of Depleted Uranium at the Clive Facility		
2. Filename: Clive DU PA FEP Analysis.pdf		
3. Description: <a href="#">This documents the development and analysis of features, events, and processes for disposal of depleted uranium at the Clive, Utah Facility.</a>		
	Name	Date
4. Originator	<a href="#">Jenifer Linville</a>	<a href="#">28 May 2011</a>
5. Reviewer	<a href="#">John Tauxe</a>	<a href="#">28 May 2014</a>
6. Remarks		

This page intentionally left blank, aside from this statement.

## CONTENTS

TABLES .....	v
1.0 Introduction.....	1
2.0 Identification of Features, Events, and Processes.....	1
2.1 Compilation of FEPs .....	2
2.2 Normalization and Consolidation of FEPs.....	2
3.0 Classifying Features, Events, and Processes .....	3
4.0 Screening of FEPs.....	4
4.1 Regulatory Considerations, Guidance, and Supporting Information.....	4
4.1.1 Nuclear Regulatory Commission: 10 CFR 61.....	5
4.1.2 Utah Administrative Code R313: Radiation Control .....	5
4.1.3 Additional Guidance.....	6
4.2 Scope of Assessment and Physical Reasonableness .....	7
5.0 Screening Results.....	7
6.0 Use of FEPs for Conceptual Model and Scenario Development.....	8
7.0 References.....	12
Appendix: FEP Listings.....	14

**TABLES**

Table 1. List of Initial FEPs by Reference.....14  
Table 2. List of consolidated FEPs evaluated for inclusion in the conceptual site model and scenarios.....~~4735~~  
Table 3. List of FEPs dismissed from further consideration. ....~~5543~~

## 1.0 Introduction

The safe storage and disposal of depleted uranium (DU) waste is essential for mitigating releases of radioactive materials and reducing exposures to humans and the environment. Currently, a radioactive waste facility located in Clive, Utah (the “Clive facility”) operated by EnergySolutions is proposed to receive and store DU waste that has been declared surplus from radiological facilities across the nation. The Clive facility has been tasked with disposing of the DU waste in an economically feasible manner that protects humans from radiological releases.

To assess whether that the proposed Clive facility DU disposal location and containment technologies are suitable for protection of human health, specific performance objectives for land disposal of radioactive waste set forth in Title 10 Code of Federal Regulations Part 61 (10 CFR 61) Subpart C, promulgated by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), must be met. In order to support the required radiological performance assessment (PA), a detailed computer model is being developed to evaluate the potential detrimental effects on human health that would result from the disposal of DU and its associated radioactive contaminants.

A key activity in developing a PA for a radiological waste repository is the comprehensive identification of relevant external factors that should be included in quantitative analyses. These factors, termed “features, events, and processes” (FEPs), form the basis for scenarios that are evaluated to assess site performance.

Although it is not a governing regulation for the disposal of LLW and DU at Clive, Title 40 CFR Part 191, promulgated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), provides a useful and general definition for the scope of a PA analysis of a radiological disposal facility. The PA 1) identifies the processes and events that might affect the disposal system, 2) examines the effects of these processes and events on the performance of the disposal system, and 3) estimates the cumulative releases of radionuclides considering the associated uncertainties caused by all significant processes and events (40 CFR 191). The identification of FEPs is essential to the development of the conceptual site model (CSM) and model scenario development process (see *Conceptual Site Model for Disposal of Depleted Uranium at the Clive Facility* white paper).

This report serves to document and examine the universe of FEPs that may apply to the disposal of depleted uranium (DU) waste at the Clive Facility. FEPs that are screened and identified as relevant for the Clive facility PA are identified in this white paper and are further elaborated in the CSM [document](#) white paper.

This document is considered to be a living document that is synchronized with current conceptual models, analysis, and modeling of the PA. As concepts and modeling evolve, so too will this document.

## 2.0 Identification of Features, Events, and Processes

The identification of FEPs for use in the Clive [facility PA-DU PA Model](#) was an iterative process that began with compiling an exhaustive list of candidate FEPs that could affect the long-term

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

performance of the radiological waste repository. As an initial step, all potentially relevant FEPs from a variety of reference sources were collected. The initial list from external sources was modified as additional FEPs were identified that are specific to the Clive facility.

This exhaustive initial compilation of FEPs led to significant redundancy across the original sources. Redundancy was addressed by the modification of the candidate list of FEPs through normalization (removal of redundant FEPs) and assignment of FEPs categories (grouping of common FEPs). This section describes the FEP identification process, including implementation of the normalization, categorization and screening processes.

## **2.1 Compilation of FEPs**

The initial list of FEPs pertaining to the efficacy of disposal of radioactive wastes in general was compiled from several scenario development documents published for other nuclear waste disposal facilities, including those for Yucca Mountain Project, the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, and several foreign radioactive waste projects. The primary literature source for FEP analysis is Guzowski and Newman (1993). They compiled over 700 potentially disruptive FEPs from a review of scenario documentation from other waste repositories around the world.

The facilities considered in Guzowski and Newman have substantially different geological, environmental and regulatory settings from those of the Clive facility. Consequently, the collection of FEPs in Guzowski and Newman provides a substantial list that should be considered for any PA, but they are also missing FEPs that pertain more particularly to the waste disposal facility at Clive. Site-specific understanding of the environmental and engineered attributes of the Clive facility, and the potentially affected region and population, was used to augment the initial compilation of FEPs.

Additional FEPs were also identified from the Nuclear Energy Agency database (NEA, 2000). In this initial compilation step, nearly 1,000 FEPs were identified from the literature and site-specific considerations. Initial FEPs compiled from all sources are listed in Table 1 in the Appendix.

## **2.2 Normalization and Consolidation of FEPs**

Subsequent to the initial compilation of FEPs, steps were taken to reduce redundancy. Initially, FEPs were sorted alphabetically and duplicates were deleted. Recorded FEP values that were different only in vernacular/diction (e.g., “climate change” versus “change in climate”) were normalized to capture a single primary FEP value for a series of identical or closely-related concepts.

To address duplication of FEPs where similar terminology was stated dissimilarly, initial FEPs were grouped by keyword content (e.g., “climate,” “waste,” “groundwater,” etc.) and evaluated for possible normalization or consolidation. Where possible, FEPs were normalized to a standard terminology.

Similar but not identical FEPs were maintained, to be evaluated as part of the consolidation step. At this point, each FEP was considered for its similarity to other FEPs, so that they could be grouped into fewer classes, making the list more manageable. For example, all geochemical processes were grouped together. These would be easier to address as a group for inclusion in the CSM. Likewise, all coastal processes could be considered for exclusion as a group. For each FEP, the rationale behind its grouping was noted. No FEPs were excluded at this step, but nearly all were consolidated with others. This consolidation process reduced the total number to 135 unique FEP groupings.

### **3.0 Classifying Features, Events, and Processes**

Following the normalization and consolidation steps, the 135 unique FEP groups were carried forward to the classification step and were considered for inclusion in the conceptual model scenarios. The classification is principally an organizational tool for the FEP analysis, although the categories identified also relate to components of the CSM. The 135 unique FEP groups were classified into the following 18 categories:

- Celestial
- Climate change
- Containerization
- Contaminant Migration
- Engineered Features
- Exposure
- Hydrology
- Geochemical
- Geological
- Human Processes
- Hydrogeological
- Marine
- Meteorology
- Model Settings
- Other Natural Processes
- Source Release
- Tectonic/Seismic/Volcanic
- Waste

These categories are relevant to the development of scenarios and are integral to the CSM for the Clive Facility. Occasionally, a FEP could have been classified into more than one category. However, the overall goal of the FEP analysis is to identify those processes that should be carried forward into the CSM, and subsequently into the modeling. Provided each FEP is identified in one of the categories, it was carried forward to the CSM. Ultimately, each FEP was

given due consideration, and the implementation of relevant FEPs in the final modeling was rather independent of the classification.

## **4.0 Screening of FEPs**

The long list of FEPs was screened in consideration of regulatory concern and professional judgment based on physical reasonableness, probability of occurrence, severity of consequence, and assessment scope.

The most basic screening criterion is regulatory concern. Regulatory requirements for performance of EnergySolutions' Clive facility are published in 10 CFR 61 and Utah Administrative Code R313. While the mention of something that can be construed as a feature, event, or process in the text of a regulation triggers its consideration in this FEP analysis, it does not mean that the FEP must become part of the PA analysis or modeling.

A subjective element of the FEP screening process is consideration of assessment scope and physical reasonableness. Physical reasonableness is a professional judgment based on logical arguments using available data and information to support a conclusion of whether or not conditions can exist within the period of regulatory concern that will result in the occurrence of a particular event or process that affects disposal system performance. In addition to meeting screening criteria, some FEPs were retained as model parameters specifically because they pertain to scenario development itself (e.g., exposure terms).

The inclusion or dismissal of FEPs and associated rationale is documented in support of constructing the conceptual model and scenarios. The product of this screening procedure is the identification of those FEPs that, either alone or in conjunction with others, could affect the performance of the disposal system.

### **4.1 Regulatory Considerations, Guidance, and Supporting Information**

This section discusses the regulatory language, guidance, and other supporting information to be considered in developing scenarios and conceptual models for the Clive [Facility PA, DU PA Model](#). Specific considerations of NRC's land disposal performance requirements (10 CFR 61 Subpart C) are required for the [PA](#)-scenario development and are important to document as part of the FEP compilation and screening activity. In addition, observations and recommendations previously published by radioactive waste disposal facility working groups and technical advisers are also considered, although most of these are focused on geologic disposal of radioactive wastes.

Specific provisions of regulations for the operation and closure of a land-disposal LLW facility were specifically considered if they were mentioned in a regulatory document.

Based on these provisions, 55 of 135 FEPs were identified as relevant for evaluation in the conceptual model or exposure scenarios. The remaining FEPs were dismissed from further

consideration for various reasons. Some, like a direct impact from a large meteorite, are simply beyond the scope of the PA-analysis. Tsunami and other marine phenomena obviously do not apply at the Clive facility. Several FEPs from the original sources were dismissed because they apply only to geologic repositories, or to specific types of containment, like copper canisters for used nuclear fuel.

#### 4.1.1 Nuclear Regulatory Commission: 10 CFR 61

This regulation contains Federal procedural requirements and performance objectives applicable to land disposal of radioactive waste. Specific considerations of 10 CFR 61 include attributes of facility siting, facility engineering (including post-closure stability and control), site monitoring, record-keeping, protection of health and safety, and a minimum time frame for which an assessment must be conducted to ensure long-term stability of the disposal site. The types of FEPs-objectives mentioned in 10 CFR 61 include:

- long-term effectiveness based on physical siting of the disposal unit (including site geology and hydrology),
- protection of the general population (in terms of radiological dose),
- protection of inadvertent intruders (dose),
- protection of individuals during operations (dose),
- isolation and segregation of wastes,
- limitation of releases of radionuclides via pathways in air, water, surface water, plant uptake, or exhumation by burrowing animals~~releases of radionuclides via pathways in air, water, surface water, plant uptake, or exhumation by burrowing animals,~~
- long-term stability of the disposal site,
- evaluation of engineering failures, including erosion, mass wasting, slope failure, settlement of wastes and backfill, infiltration through covers, and surface drainage,
- site monitoring requirements,
- identification of natural resources whose exploitation could result in inadvertent exposure, and
- efficacy of institutional controls.

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

#### 4.1.2 Utah Administrative Code R313: Radiation Control

The Utah Administrative Code (UAC) Rules 313-15 (*Standards for Protection Against Radiation*) and 313-25 (*License Requirements for Land Disposal of Radioactive Waste*) mirror the provisions for land disposal of radioactive waste provided in 10 CFR 61. Notable performance objectives of near-surface disposal sites established of UAC Rule R313-25 include~~Notable technical performance objectives of near surface disposal sites established of UAC Rule R313-25 include:~~

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

- protection of the general population,
- protection of inadvertent intruders,

- consideration of releases of radionuclides through pathways via air, water, surface water, plant uptake, and exhumation of burrowing animals,
- protection of individuals during operations,
- long-term stability of the disposal site,
- prevention of erosion, mass wasting, slope failure, settlement of wastes and backfill, infiltration through covers, and surface drainage,
- site monitoring requirements, and
- identification of natural resources whose exploitation could result in inadvertent exposure.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.39", Hanging: 0.1", Tab stops: Not at 0.8"

The majority of the FEPs identified as relevant under 10 CFR 61 are also applicable under UAC Rule R313-25 and are retained for analysis.

#### 4.1.3 Additional Guidance

The NRC's PA working group has identified additional considerations in NRC's *Performance Assessment Methodology* (NRC 2000). The working group identifies two specific areas of interest in conducting a PA: pathway analysis and dose assessment.

Pathway analysis involves the mechanisms of radionuclide transfer through the biosphere to humans. These mechanisms, or transport and exposure pathways, must be identified and modeled. Pathway analysis should result in the determination of the total intake of radionuclides by the average member of the critical group. The critical group is defined as the "...group of individuals reasonably expected to receive the greatest dose from radioactive releases from the disposal facility over time, given the circumstances under which the analysis would be carried out" (NRC 2000).

Various considerations should be taken into account when analyzing the transport of radionuclides through the biosphere (to humans). These considerations should include

- modeling the movement of radionuclides through the environment and the food chain, adequately reflecting complex symbiotic systems and relationships,
- considering mechanisms of (biotic and) human uptake of radionuclides, and
- identifying usage, production, and consumption parameters, for various food products and related systems, that may vary widely, depending on regional climate conditions, local or ethnic diet, and habits.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.39", Hanging: 0.1", Tab stops: Not at 0.8"

The dose assessment requires that the dosimetry of the exposed individual be modeled. The objective of dose modeling in a LLW PA is to provide estimates of potential doses to humans, in terms of the average member of the critical group, from radioactive releases from a LLW disposal facility, after closure.

A "current conditions" philosophy is initially applied to determine which pathways are to be evaluated. That is to say that current regional land use and other local conditions in place at the

time of the analysis will strongly influence pathways that are considered to be significant. The conceptual model and scenarios must consider each of the general pathways discussed in 10 CFR 61.13. Additional pathways for consideration are published in NUREG/CR-5453 (Shipers, 1989) and NUREG-1200 (NRC, 1994). NUREG-1200 discusses example potential “scenarios by which radioactivity may be released from the disposal facility and cause the potential for radiological impacts on individuals.” Shipers (1989) identifies exposure pathways, and scenarios regarding transport mechanisms that could contribute to the release of radioactive materials from the disposal facility leading to human exposure, in the context of near-surface LLW disposal.

## 4.2 Scope of Assessment and Physical Reasonableness

The final phase of FEP screening is the application of professional judgment in terms of the scope of the PA and the physical reasonableness of evaluating those FEPs in the CSM and scenarios. Performance objectives include protection of the general population from releases of radioactivity (10 CFR 61.41), protection of individuals from inadvertent intrusion (§61.42), and stability of the site after closure (§61.44). Assumptions of the scope of the PA include:

- Performance assessment reflects post-closure conditions. Because PA considers the site only after closure, consideration of the protection of individuals during operations (§61.43) is not within the scope of the evaluation and FEPs related to operations are not considered relevant to the CSM or scenarios.
- Land-use assumptions relative to human exposures post-closure are based on current conditions and likely future conditions. Therefore urban settlement, residential use, farming, and aquaculture and FEPs pertaining to these incongruous uses are not included in the CSM or scenarios because of the high concentrations of salt in the soil and groundwater of this site. However, hunting, ranching, and recreational use are considered viable scenarios.
- Intentional human intruders are not protected.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.39", Hanging: 0.1", Tab stops: Not at 0.8"

## 5.0 Screening Results

**Using the identification and screening processes described in Sections 1 through 3, FEPs consolidated from an exhaustive list of over 900 to 135 FEPs or FEP categories. consolidation, 90 FEPs are retained for further consideration and 45 FEPs were inclusion in the PA model. All FEPs considered and retained for inclusion in the scenarios are reported in**

---

[Table 2](#) in the Appendix. FEPs that were considered and dismissed from evaluation in the CSM and scenarios are listed in Table 3, along with a brief rationale for their exclusion.

In summary, FEPs retained for consideration in the PA, CSM, and scenarios pertain to regulatory aspects of post-closure protection of human health and long-term stability of the disposal facility for the duration and spatial scope of the assessment period. FEPs that were dismissed from consideration in the PA include those that do not fall within the scope of the PA, were characterized as extremely unlikely to occur or having a low magnitude of consequence of affecting the performance of the repository, or were dismissed based on site-specific considerations.

## 6.0 Use of FEPs for Conceptual Model and Scenario Development

The CSM provides detailed descriptions of the physical environment, the engineered disposal facility, the sources and chemical forms of disposed wastes, potentially affected media, potential release pathways and exposure routes, and potential receptors. The CSM considers broad categories of FEPs that are relevant to these attributes, but individual FEPs may or may not be addressed in the CSM based on the scope of the assessment and the scenarios developed. This section identifies the FEPs that are considered for inclusion in the CSM and are addressed in the development of scenarios for the PA model. These are grouped into several categories, and listed in tabulated form in Appendix B. Those FEPs that were dismissed from consideration in the modeling are listed in Appendix C. Some FEPs may overlap or repeat between categories.

### Meteorology

Frost weathering and other meteorological events (e.g., precipitation, atmospheric dispersion, resuspension) are considered in the conceptual model. Weathering may occur from frost cycles. Resuspension of particulates from surface soils allows them to be redistributed by atmospheric dispersion, which is a meteorological phenomenon. Dust devils are also possible at the site and a tornado occurred in Salt Lake City in 1999, which was the first tornado in Utah in over 100 years.

### Climate change

Features, events, and processes of climate change considered in the conceptual model include effects on hydrology (including lake effects), hydrogeology, biota, and human behaviors. Lake effects include appearance/disappearance of large lakes and associated phenomena (sedimentation, wave action, erosion/inundation). Wave action, including seiches, is included in the CSM.

## **Hydrology**

Hydrology is addressed in the conceptual model since it influences many processes in contaminant transport. Examples of FEPs considered for the conceptual model include groundwater transport, inundation, and water table changes.

## **Hydrogeological**

Several hydrogeological FEPs were identified for consideration in the conceptual model. Groundwater transport, in both the unsaturated and saturated zones, is potentially a significant transport pathway. For some model endpoints, such as groundwater concentrations that are compared to groundwater protection levels (GWPLs), it is the only pathway of concern.

Groundwater flow and transport processes include advection-dispersion, diffusion, fluid migration, waterborne contaminant transport, changes in the flow system, recharge, water table movements, and brine interactions. Inundation of the site may occur due to changes in lakes or reservoirs, which is included in lake effects of climate change.

## **Geochemical**

Geochemical effects include chemical sorption and partitioning between phases, aqueous solubility, precipitation, chemical stability, complexation, changes in water chemistry (redox potential, pH, Eh), fluid interactions, speciation, interactions with clays and other host materials, and leaching of radionuclides from the waste form. These processes are addressed in the model.

## **Other Natural Processes**

The broad category of other natural processes considered for the conceptual model include ecological changes and pedogenesis (soil formation). Ecological changes are associated with catastrophic events (e.g., inundation), evolution, or climate change. Pedogenesis is expected on the cap, giving rise to vegetation growth or habitation by wildlife.

Denudation (cap erosion) may be sufficient to expose waste. Erosion of the repository resulting from pluvial, fluvial or aeolian processes can result from extreme precipitation, changes in surface water channels, and weathering. Sediment transport is an inherent aspect of erosion. Sedimentation/deposition onto the repository would also affect disposal at the site.

Note that seismic activity is unlikely to impact the Clive facility. Faults are not present within the vicinity of Clive, although effects of isostatic rebound are still possible in the Lake Bonneville area.

## **Engineered Features**

Engineered features are intended to promote containment and inhibit migration of contaminants. Conditions potentially affecting site performance include failure of general engineered features, repository design, repository seals, material properties, and subsidence of the repository.

### Containerization

Two key components of containerization were identified as FEPs: containment degradation and corrosion. Canister degradation, including fractures, fissures, and corrosion (pitting, rusting) could result in containment failure. These processes are evaluated in the conceptual model [\(Conceptual Site Model White Paper, Section 8.1\)](#).

Formatted: Font: Italic

### Waste

Attributes of waste that could influence the performance of the Clive facility include the inventory of radionuclides, physical and chemical waste forms, container performance, matrix performance, leaching, radon emanation, and other waste release mechanisms.

### Source Release

Source release can result from many mechanisms, including containment failure, leaching, radon emanation, plant uptake, and translocation by burrowing animals. FEPs that fit in the category of source release include gas generation, radioactive decay and in-growth, and radon emanation.

### Contaminant Migration

Contaminant migration for the CSM includes the mechanisms and processes by which radionuclides may come to be located outside of the containment unit. The following contaminant migration processes were identified for consideration in the conceptual model: resuspension, atmospheric dispersion, biotically-induced transport, contaminant transport, diffusion, dilution, advection-dispersion, dissolution, dust devils, tornados, infiltration, and preferential pathways.

Animal ingestion is part of the human exposure model, both as ingestion of fodder and feed by livestock, and ingestion of livestock by humans. Transport by atmospheric dispersion is modeled and is associated with limited resuspension, dust devils, and tornados. Modeling of biotic (plant- and animal-mediated) processes leading to contaminant transport, and the evolution of these processes in response to climate change and other influences, including bioturbation, burrowing, root development, and contaminant uptake and translocation are considered. Contaminant transport includes transport media (water, air, soil), transport processes (advection-dispersion, diffusion, plant uptake, soil translocation), and partitioning between phases. Diffusion occurs in gas and water phases. Dilution occurs when mixing with less concentrated water. Hydrodynamic dispersion is associated with water advection. Dissolution in water is limited by aqueous solubility. Transport in the gas phase includes gas generation in the waste, partitioning between air and water phases, diffusion in air and water, and radioactive decay and ingrowth. Infiltration of water through the cap, into wastes, and potentially to the groundwater is another contaminant migration concern. Preferential pathways for contaminant transport are also addressed.

### **Human Processes**

The FEPs identified as human processes encompass human behaviors and activities, resource use, and unintentional intrusion into the repository. Human process FEPs identified for assessment are related to the human exposure model and include anthropogenic climate change, human behavior, human-induced processes related to engineered features at the site, human-induced transport, inadvertent human intrusion, institutional control, land use, post-closure subsurface activities, waste recovery, water resource management, and weapons training such as that occurring at nearby bombing ranges.

### **Exposure**

Exposure is an integral part of the conceptual model, and may result from reduced site performance. Exposure-relevant FEPs identified for evaluation include those related to dosimetry, exposure media, human exposure, ingestion pathways, and inhalation pathways. Dosimetry as a science is not a FEP *per se* but physiological dose response is accounted for in the PA model.

Transport pathways (e.g. food chains) that lead to foodstuff contamination, and human exposures due to inhalation of gaseous radionuclides and particulates are included. Exposure media include are foodstuffs, drinking water, and environmental media. Exposure pathways (ingestion, inhalation, etc.) and physiological effects from radionuclides and toxic contaminants (e.g. uranium) are also assessed.

### **Model Settings**

Model settings that were identified during the FEP compilation process include model parameterization, period of performance, regulatory requirements, and spatial domain. While these are not FEPs in and of themselves, they are important considerations in the performance assessment model and are included with the FEPs for completeness.

## 7.0 References

- Andersson, J., T. Carlsson, T., F. Kautsky, E. Soderman, and S. Wingefors, 1989. *The Joint SKI/SKB Scenario Development Project*. SKB-TR89-35, SvenskKarnbranslehantering Ab, Stockholm, Sweden.
- Burkholder, H.C., 1980. "Waste Isolation Performance Assessment—A Status Report", in *Scientific Basis for Nuclear Waste Management*, Ed. C.J.M. Northrup, Jr., Plenum Press, New York, NY, Vol. 2, p. 689-702.
- Code of Federal Regulations, Title 10, Part 61 (10 CFR 61), *Licensing Requirements for Land Disposal of Radioactive Waste*, Government Printing Office, 2007.
- Code of Federal Regulations, Title 40, Part 191 (40 CFR 191), *Environmental Radiation Protection Standards for Management and Disposal of Spent Nuclear Fuel, High-Level and Transuranic Radioactive Waste*, Government Printing Office, 1993.
- Guzowski, R.V., 1990. *Preliminary Identification of Scenarios That May Affect the Escape and Transport of Radionuclides From the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, Southeastern New Mexico*, SAND89-7149, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM.
- Guzowski, R.V., and G. Newman, 1993, *Preliminary Identification of Potentially Disruptive Scenarios at the Greater Confinement Disposal Facility, Area 5 of the Nevada Test Site*, SAND93-7100, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM.
- Hertzler, C.L., and C.L. Atwood, 1989. *Preliminary Development and Screening of Release Scenarios for Greater Confinement Disposal of Transuranic Waste at the Nevada Test Site*, EGG-SARE-8767, EG&G Idaho, Inc., Idaho Falls, ID.
- Hunter, R.L., 1983. *Preliminary Scenarios for the Release of Radioactive Waste From a Hypothetical Repository in Basalt of the Columbia Plateau*, SAND83-1342 (NUREG/CR-3353), Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM.
- Hunter, R.L., 1989. *Events and Processes for Constructing Scenarios for the Release of Transuranic Waste From the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, Southeastern New Mexico*, SAND89-2546, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM.
- Koplik, C.M., M.F. Kaplan, and B. Ross, 1982. "The Safety of Repositories for Highly Radioactive Wastes," *Reviews of Modern Physics*, Vol. 54, no. 1, p. 269-310.
- Merrett, GJ., and P.A. Gillespie, 1983. *Nuclear Fuel Waste Disposal: Long-Term Stability Analysis*, AECL-6820, Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, Pinawa, Manitoba.
- NEA (Nuclear Energy Agency), 1992, *Systematic Approach to Scenario Development. A report of the NEA Working Group on the Identification and Selection of Scenarios for Performance Assessment of Radioactive Waste Disposal*, Nuclear Energy Agency, Paris, France.
- NEA, 2000. *Features, Events, and Processes (FEPs) for Geologic Disposal of Radioactive Waste. An International Database*. Nuclear Energy Agency, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

NRC (U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission), 1994. *Standard Review Plan for the Review of a License Application for a Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Facility*, NUREG-1200, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C.

NRC, 2000. *A Performance Assessment Methodology for Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Facilities*, NUREG-1573, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C.

Shipers, L.R., 1989, *Background Information for the Development of a Low-Level Waste Performance Assessment Methodology, Identification of Potential Exposure Pathways*, NUREG/CR-5453, Vol. 1 , U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, December 1989.

## **Appendix: FEP Listings**

**This appendix lists the features, events, and processes (FEPs) identified for evaluation in Conceptual Site Model and Performance Assessment Scenario development. Table 1 contains all initial FEP values, listed and numbered by reference document.**

---



































**Table 1 (continued)**

FEP ID	Initial FEP	Reference <sup>1</sup>
521	Ecological response to climate changes	NEA OECD, 2000
522	Hydrological/hydrogeological response to climate changes	NEA OECD, 2000
523	Sea Level change	NEA OECD, 2000
524	Warm climate effects (tropical and desert)	NEA OECD, 2000
525	Glacial and ice sheet effects, local	NEA OECD, 2000
526	Periglacial effects	NEA OECD, 2000
527	Container materials and characteristics	NEA OECD, 2000
528	Atmospheric transport of contaminants	NEA OECD, 2000
529	Vegetation	NEA OECD, 2000
530	Animal populations	NEA OECD, 2000
531	Biological/biochemical processes and conditions (in geosphere)	NEA OECD, 2000
532	Biological/biochemical processes and conditions (in waste and EBS)	NEA OECD, 2000
533	Species evolution	NEA OECD, 2000
534	Animal, plant and microbe mediated transport of contaminants	NEA OECD, 2000
535	Colloids, contaminant interactions and transport with	NEA OECD, 2000
536	Contaminant transport path characteristics (in geosphere)	NEA OECD, 2000
537	Chemical/complexing agents, effects on contaminant speciation/transport	NEA OECD, 2000
538	Solid-mediated transport of contaminants	NEA OECD, 2000
539	Sorption/desorption processes, contaminant	NEA OECD, 2000
540	Speciation and solubility, contaminant	NEA OECD, 2000
541	Dissolution, precipitation, and crystallization, contaminant	NEA OECD, 2000
542	Noble gases	NEA OECD, 2000
543	Volatiles and potential for volatility	NEA OECD, 2000
544	Gas-mediated transport of contaminants	NEA OECD, 2000
545	Geological resources	NEA OECD, 2000
546	Geological units, other	NEA OECD, 2000
547	Host rock	NEA OECD, 2000
548	Repository assumptions	NEA OECD, 2000

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt

Formatted Table

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt

**Table 1 (continued)**

FEP ID	Initial FEP	Reference <sup>1</sup>
549	Thermal processes and conditions (in geosphere)	NEA OECD, 2000
550	Excavation disturbed zone, host rock	NEA OECD, 2000
551	Buffer/backfill materials and characteristics	NEA OECD, 2000
552	Other engineered features materials and characteristics	NEA OECD, 2000
553	Thermal processes and conditions (in wastes and EBS)	NEA OECD, 2000
554	Emplacement of wastes and backfilling	NEA OECD, 2000
555	Repository design	NEA OECD, 2000
556	Mechanical processes and conditions (in geosphere)	NEA OECD, 2000
557	Mechanical processes and conditions (in wastes and EBS)	NEA OECD, 2000
558	Seals. cavern/tunnel/shaft	NEA OECD, 2000
559	Closure and repository sealing	NEA OECD, 2000
560	Dose response assumptions	NEA OECD, 2000
561	Dosimetry	NEA OECD, 2000
562	Drinking water, foodstuffs and drugs, contaminant concentrations in	NEA OECD, 2000
563	Environmental media, contaminant concentrations in	NEA OECD, 2000
564	Impacts or concern	NEA OECD, 2000
565	Human characteristics (physiology, metabolism)	NEA OECD, 2000
566	Chemical/organic toxin stability	NEA OECD, 2000
567	Exposure modes	NEA OECD, 2000
568	Non-food products, contaminant concentrations in	NEA OECD, 2000
569	Nonradiological toxicity/effects	NEA OECD, 2000
570	Radiological toxicity/effects	NEA OECD, 2000
571	Radon and radon daughter exposure	NEA OECD, 2000
572	Diet and fluid Intake	NEA OECD, 2000
573	Food and water processing and preparation	NEA OECD, 2000
574	Food chains, uptake of contaminants in	NEA OECD, 2000
575	Chemical/geochemical processes and conditions (in geosphere)	NEA OECD, 2000
576	Chemical/geochemical processes and conditions (In wastes and	NEA OECD, 2000
577	Organics and potential for organic forms	NEA OECD, 2000

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt

Formatted Table

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt











**Table 1 (continued)**

FEP ID	Initial FEP	Reference <sup>1</sup>
728	exploitation drilling	NEA, 1992
729	exploratory drilling	NEA, 1992
730	resource mining	NEA, 1992
731	quarrying, near surface extraction	NEA, 1992
732	sabotage	NEA, 1992
733	malicious intrusion (sabotage, act of war)	NEA, 1992
734	recovery of repository materials	NEA, 1992
735	recovery of repository materials	NEA, 1992
736	ground-water abstraction	NEA, 1992
737	dams and reservoirs, built/drained	NEA, 1992
738	coastal erosion and estuarine development	NEA, 1992
739	denudation (eolian and fluvial)	NEA, 1992
740	chemical denudation and weathering	NEA, 1992
741	freshwater sediment transport and deposition	NEA, 1992
742	fracture mineralization and weathering	NEA, 1992
743	rock heterogeneity (permeability, mineralogy), affecting water and	NEA, 1992
744	river, stream, channel erosion (downcutting)	NEA, 1992
745	marine sediment transport and deposition	NEA, 1992
746	extremes of precipitation, snow melt and associated flooding	NEA, 1992
747	effects at saline-freshwater interface	NEA, 1992
748	ground-water conditions (saturated/unsaturated)	NEA, 1992
749	ground-water discharge (to surface water, springs, soils, wells, and marine)	NEA, 1992
750	ground-water flow (Darcy, non-Darcy, intergranular fracture,	NEA, 1992
751	recharge to ground water	NEA, 1992
752	saline or freshwater intrusion	NEA, 1992
753	natural thermal effects	NEA, 1992
754	induced hydrological changes (fluid pressure, density convection, viscosity)	NEA, 1992
755	site flooding	NEA, 1992

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt

Formatted Table

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt



**Table 1 (continued)**

FEP ID	Initial FEP	Reference <sup>1</sup>
784	plate movement/tectonic change	NEA, 1992
785	undetected features (faults, fracture networks, shear zones, brecciation, gas pockets)	NEA, 1992
786	magmatic activity (intrusive, extrusive)	NEA, 1992
787	nuclear criticality	NEA, 1992
788	inadvertent inclusion of undesirable materials	NEA, 1992
789	Recurrence of Lake Bonneville	Neptune
790	Wave action	Neptune
791	Animal burrowing	Neptune
792	Dust devils	Neptune
793	Barrier stability during inundation	Neptune
794	inhalation pathways	Neptune
795	human induced hydraulic fracturing	Neptune
796	natural hydraulic fracturing (hydrogeological)	Neptune
797	Sedimentation	Neptune
798	Inundation	Neptune
799	radon emanation	Neptune
800	natural hydraulic fracturing (tectonic/seismic/volcanic)	Neptune
801	Off-Site Residents: impacts on the site by people who might use the area but don't live on the site itself.	Neptune
802	On-Site Residents: water well with desalinization; construction-related activities like basements, footings, and utilities; enhanced infiltration from septic; altered plant/animal communities; effect of grading on infiltration; effect of buildings and pavement on evapotranspiration.	Neptune
803	Agricultural activities	Neptune
804	Explosions and Crashes related to plane crashes, bombs	Neptune
805	Accidental Intrusion, facility properties intact: mineral, oil and gas, geothermal or other resource exploration; water well with desalinization; construction-related activities	Neptune
806	Accidental Intrusion, facility properties altered due to prior volcanic or seismic event	Neptune
807	FEPs related to post-closure inhabitation of the area	Neptune
808	Deliberate Intrusion (purposeful waste retrieval; archeology; terrorism, etc)	Neptune

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt

Formatted Table

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt

**Table 1 (continued)**

FEP ID	Initial FEP	Reference <sup>1</sup>
809	FEPs related to post-closure intrusion by nonresidents who come looking for something, or to some kind of major accident like a plane crash either before or after closure	Neptune
810	meteorite	Prij et al. 1991
811	climatic variability	Prij et al. 1991
812	minor climatic changes	Prij et al. 1991
813	sea-level changes	Prij et al. 1991
814	ecological response to climate	Prij et al. 1991
815	glaciation	Prij et al. 1991
816	periglacial effects	Prij et al. 1991
817	canister defects	Prij et al. 1991
818	common cause (canister) failures	Prij et al. 1991
819	fracturing	Prij et al. 1991
820	embrittlement, cracking	Prij et al. 1991
821	metallic corrosion	Prij et al. 1991
822	bioturbation of soil sediment	Prij et al. 1991
823	radiocolloid formation	Prij et al. 1991
824	accumulation in soils, organic debris	Prij et al. 1991
825	transport of radionuclides	Prij et al. 1991
826	advection and dispersion	Prij et al. 1991
827	matrix diffusion	Prij et al. 1991
828	multiphase flow	Prij et al. 1991
829	leaching of nuclides	Prij et al. 1991
830	non-radioactive solute in geosphere	Prij et al. 1991
831	diffusion	Prij et al. 1991
832	dilution of mass	Prij et al. 1991
833	dissolution/precipitation reactions	Prij et al. 1991
834	natural gas intrusion	Prij et al. 1991
835	gas mediated transport	Prij et al. 1991
836	inadequate backfill compaction, voidage	Prij et al. 1991
837	convergence of openings	Prij et al. 1991
838	dewatering of host rock	Prij et al. 1991

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt

Formatted Table

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt



**Table 1 (continued)**

FEP ID	Initial FEP	Reference <sup>1</sup>
870	chemical equilibrium reactions	Prij et al. 1991
871	counter, competitive, and potential determining ions	Prij et al. 1991
872	physico-chemical characteristics influencing chemical equilibria	Prij et al. 1991
873	redox conditions	Prij et al. 1991
874	geochemical alterations	Prij et al. 1991
875	diagenesis	Prij et al. 1991
876	land slide	Prij et al. 1991
877	accidents during operation	Prij et al. 1991
878	agricultural developments and changes	Prij et al. 1991
879	anthropogenic climate changes (greenhouse effect)	Prij et al. 1991
880	abandonment of unsealed repository	Prij et al. 1991
881	poor closure	Prij et al. 1991
882	tunneling	Prij et al. 1991
883	underground construction	Prij et al. 1991
884	fisheries developments and changes	Prij et al. 1991
885	geothermal energy production	Prij et al. 1991
886	co-disposal of reactive wastes (deliberate)	Prij et al. 1991
887	Human Induced Phenomena	Prij et al. 1991
888	undetected past intrusions	Prij et al. 1991
889	injection of fluids	Prij et al. 1991
890	loss of records	Prij et al. 1991
891	archaeological investigation	Prij et al. 1991
892	irrigation	Prij et al. 1991
893	changes in land use	Prij et al. 1991
894	demographic developments and changes	Prij et al. 1991
895	urban developments and changes	Prij et al. 1991
896	post-closure monitoring	Prij et al. 1991
897	underground nuclear testing	Prij et al. 1991
898	Operation and closure	Prij et al. 1991
899	phased operation effects	Prij et al. 1991

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt

Formatted Table

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt







**Table 2. List of consolidated FEPs evaluated for inclusion in the conceptual site model and scenarios**

**Table 2 (continued)**

Neptune Subgroup	Normalized FEP (accepted)	Discussion	Representative FEP IDs <sup>1</sup>
Climate change	climate change	Climate change can have a large influence on site performance. Climate change includes natural and anthropogenic changes and its effects on hydrology (including lake effects), hydrogeology, glaciation, biota, and human behaviors.	2, 3, 4, 159, 221, 222, 252, 253, 254, 321, 349, 350, 416, 417, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 651, 652, 653, 811, 812, 813, 814
	lake effects	A large lake could have detrimental effects on the repository. Lake effects include appearance/disappearance of large lakes and associated phenomena (sedimentation, wave action, erosion/inundation, isostasy). This is covered within climate change scenarios. Regulations suggest consideration.	656, 789
	wave action	Wave action, including seiches, could influence site performance and is included in long-term scenarios. See lake effects and erosion/inundation.	224, 790
Containerization	containment degradation	A number of processes can contribute to degradation of waste containment. These are accounted for in release of the source term. It is expected that no credit will be given to containment. Regulations suggest consideration.	7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 352, 496, 527, 657, 658, 817, 818, 819, 820
	corrosion	Corrosion is one of the processes that would contribute to degradation of waste containment. Regulations suggest consideration.	18, 19, 20, 161, 353, 419, 659, 821
Contaminant Migration	biotically-induced transport	Plant uptake and burrow excavation are potential contaminant transport (CT) pathways. Modeling includes biotic (plant- and animal-mediated) processes leading to contaminant transport, and the evolution of these processes in response to climate change and other influences, including bioturbation, burrowing, root development, and contaminant uptake and translocation. Regulations suggest consideration.	21, 420, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 791, 822
	colloid transport	Colloid formation could be a CT pathway. This process will be considered in the geochemistry conceptual model.	22, 23, 24, 535, 666, 823

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Superscript

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Table 2 (continued)

Neptune Subgroup	Normalized FEP (accepted)	Discussion	Representative FEP IDs <sup>1</sup>
contaminant transport		CT is a large class of processes that govern the migration of contaminants in the environment, including transport media (water, air, soil) processes (advection-dispersion, diffusion, plant uptake, soil translocation) and partitioning between phases; much overlap with atmospheric, groundwater, surface water, and biotically-induced transport. Regulations suggest consideration.	25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 162, 163, 257, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 323, 354, 355, 356, 421, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830
diffusion		Diffusion is a basic CT process that could affect performance. Diffusion occurs in gas and water phases.	36, 306, 324, 674, 831
dilution		Dilution is a basic CT process that could affect performance. Dilution occurs when mixing with less concentrated water.	37, 675, 832
dispersion		Dispersion is a basic CT process that could affect performance. Hydrodynamic dispersion is associated with water advection.	38
dissolution		Dissolution will govern leaching of the waste form into water, limited by aqueous solubility.	39, 40, 164, 225, 258, 325, 326, 422, 541, 676, 833
dust devils		Dust devils are common on the flats, and could disperse contaminants. These are included in atmospheric dispersion.	792
gas transport		Radon produced in the waste is likely to be transported via gaseous diffusion. Transport in the gas phase includes gas generation in the waste, partitioning between air and water phases, diffusion in air and water, and radioactive decay and ingrowth.	42, 43, 44, 165, 166, 259, 357, 423, 542, 543, 544, 678, 679, 835
infiltration		Infiltration through the cap materials, the waste, and unsaturated zone could be an important CT mechanism. This includes infiltration of meteoric water (precipitation minus abstractions) through the cap, into wastes, and potentially to the groundwater.	45, 260, 307
local geology		This feature will control some aspects of CT and is included implicitly in other processes. Regulations suggest consideration.	545, 546, 547

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Superscript

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Table 2 (continued)

Neptune Subgroup	Normalized FEP (accepted)	Discussion	Representative FEP IDs <sup>1</sup>
	preferential pathways	Preferential pathways could contribute to CT. Their presence is accounted for in the definition of advective and diffusive processes. Regulations suggest consideration.	46
Engineered Features	compaction error	Inadequate compaction could result in subsidence. This overlaps with subsidence and closure failure.	680, 836
	engineered features	Many engineered features are intended to improve performance. This large collection of features is intended to promote containment and inhibit migration of contaminants. Regulations suggest consideration.	48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 167, 168, 169, 170, 226, 227, 228, 261, 308, 309, 327, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 497, 498, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690
	material properties	Material properties are an essential feature of any model, and include density, porosity, hydraulic conductivity, permeability, texture, tortuosity, etc. of waste, backfill, cap materials, and naturally occurring materials.	60, 61, 62, 171, 364, 433, 692, 852, 853, 854
	repository design	Repository design clearly influences its performance. This is accounted for implicitly in the modeling of the repository. Regulations suggest consideration.	695, 696, 858, 859
	source release	Source release is an essential part of the model, and can result from many mechanisms, including containment failure, leaching, radon emanation, plant uptake, and translocation by burrowing animals.	128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 196, 291, 342, 398, 467, 468, 637, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Superscript

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Table 2 (continued)

Neptune Subgroup	Normalized FEP (accepted)	Discussion	Representative FEP IDs <sup>1</sup>
	subsidence of repository	Subsidence can compromise performance, leading to failure of the cap, and enhanced infiltration. Regulations suggest consideration.	310, 311, 329, 439, 861
	waste	Waste form and inventory are essential parts of the model. Inventory and source release includes initial inventory of radionuclides and its physical and chemical form, container performance, matrix performance, leaching, and other release mechanisms.	517, 647, 648, 649
Exposure	animal ingestion	Human ingestion of livestock and game exposed to contaminants is an exposure pathway, and is implemented as part of the human exposure model, as ingestion of fodder and feed by livestock, and ingestion of livestock by humans, and similar pathways for game. Regulations suggest consideration.	660
	dosimetry	Dosimetry hints at human dose response, which is an integral part of PA. Physiological dose response will be estimated in the PA model. Dosimetry as a science is not a FEP, <i>per se</i> . Regulations suggest consideration.	560, 561
	exposure media	Exposure media are a fundamental part of exposure pathways, and include foodstuffs, drinking water, other environmental media. These are included in the human exposure model. Regulations suggest consideration.	562, 563
	human behavior	Behavior is part of human exposure pathway. Future human behaviors include activities and their frequency and duration, distinct from food and water ingestion. Regulations suggest consideration.	584, 585, 586, 587, 588
	human exposure	Human exposure, in terms of dose and toxicity, is considered in the model, and includes exposure pathways (ingestion, inhalation, etc.) and physiological effects from radionuclides and toxic contaminants. Regulations suggest consideration.	68, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 801, 802
	ingestion pathways	Ingestion of food, water, and soils are modeled human exposure pathways. These include human exposures due to ingestion of water and foodstuffs, and transport pathways (e.g. food chains) that lead to foodstuffs. Regulations suggest consideration.	572, 573, 574

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Superscript

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Table 2 (continued)

Neptune Subgroup	Normalized FEP (accepted)	Discussion	Representative FEP IDs <sup>1</sup>
	inhalation pathways	Inhalation of gases and fine particles are modeled human exposure pathways. Regulations suggest consideration.	794
Geochemical	geochemical effects	Geochemical processes control CT in waste sources, water, and geologic media. These include chemical sorption and partitioning between phases, aqueous solubility, precipitation, chemical stability, complexing, changes in water chemistry (redox potential, pH, Eh), fluid interactions, halokinesis, diagenesis, speciation, cellulosic degradation effects, interactions with clays and other host materials, effects of corrosion products, effects of cementitious materials, and leaching.	69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 174, 264, 368, 440, 575, 576, 577, 698, 699, 700, 701, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874
Human Processes	anthropogenic climate change	This is addressed as part of climate change in general.	85, 580, 706, 879
	community development	Development of communities and other human habitation overlaps with land use and habitation, and is considered in the human exposure assessment, albeit unlikely. See inhabitation, land use. Regulations suggest consideration.	581
	excavation	Excavation includes construction of basements and other construction, and is included as part of the human intrusion scenarios.	330, 499, 582, 709, 710, 882, 883
	explosions	Human-caused explosions include bombs, plane crashes, and conventional weapons training.	230, 500, 583, 804
	human-induced processes	Human-induced processes are limited to repository design, inadvertent human intrusion, or human-induced climate change. Engineered features include repository design and new technological developments. Intentional intrusion is not considered. Anthropogenic climate change is considered under climate change.	90, 91, 92, 177, 271, 272, 372, 443, 589, 590, 712, 713, 886
	human-induced transport	Human activities that could contribute to release are considered. Humans can induce contaminant transport through a variety of activities. See inadvertent human intrusion.	273, 274, 591, 592, 795, 887
	inadvertent human intrusion	Inadvertent human intrusion into the waste is considered in the development of exposure pathways. Regulations suggest consideration.	178, 179, 231, 275, 276, 277, 373, 374, 375, 444, 445, 446, 714, 805, 806, 888

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Superscript

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Table 2 (continued)

Neptune Subgroup	Normalized FEP (accepted)	Discussion	Representative FEP IDs <sup>1</sup>
	inhabitation	Inhabitation on or near the site, including the establishment of surface or underground dwellings, communities, or cities, is extremely unlikely. See community development, land use. Regulations suggest consideration.	93, 94, 593, 594, 807
	institutional control	Institutional control affects human exposures, and includes records of site knowledge, markers, barriers, and security, and the loss thereof. Regulations suggest consideration.	95, 595, 596, 597, 716, 890
	land use	Land use in general could affect exposure scenarios. Land use changes are related to demographics, including development of agricultural, industrial, urban, or wild land uses. Regulations suggest consideration.	183, 450, 600, 601, 602, 719, 720, 893, 894, 895
	post-closure subsurface activities	Subsurface human activities are covered to the extent that they are inadvertent. This could include intrusion, construction, investigation, drilling, or mining. Regulations suggest consideration.	727, 904, 905, 906
Hydrogeological	denudation	Denudation could expose wastes, and is combined with erosion and inundation. Regulations suggest consideration.	192, 388, 460, 502, 503, 739, 917
	erosion	Erosion of the repository resulting from pluvial, fluvial, or aeolian processes can result from extreme precipitation, changes in surface water channels, and weathering. Regulations suggest consideration.	110, 238, 284, 389, 504, 613, 740, 918, 919, 920, 921
	erosional transport	Erosional (sediment) transport could be a CT mechanism. Sediments may move during erosion; includes solifluction. Regulations suggest consideration.	111, 239, 614, 615, 741, 742, 922, 923
	hydrogeological effects	Hydrogeological and groundwater hydraulics changes may occur in response to geological changes, including hydrothermal activity. This is generally covered under groundwater transport. Regulations suggest consideration.	112, 616, 617, 618, 619, 743, 744, 796, 924
	sedimentation	Sedimentation would occur on a lake bottom, and could affect performance. This includes sedimentation/aggradation onto the repository.	113, 193, 285, 335, 390, 461, 621, 797

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Superscript

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Table 2 (continued)

Neptune Subgroup	Normalized FEP (accepted)	Discussion	Representative FEP IDs <sup>1</sup>
Hydrology	groundwater transport	Groundwater transport includes waterborne contaminant transport (CT) in the unsaturated and saturated zones, and is a principal CT mechanism. Groundwater flow and transport mechanisms include advection-dispersion, diffusion, fluid migration, waterborne contaminant transport, changes in the flow system, recharge and discharge, water table movements, and brine interactions.	114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 286, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 336, 337, 338, 339, 392, 393, 622, 623, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 942
	hydrological effects	Hydrological processes are considered under the topics of surface water and groundwater. Regulations suggest consideration.	463, 505, 624, 753, 754, 936, 937
	inundation	Inundation by a large lake or reservoir is likely to affect the site in the long term. (See also: wave action, and lake effects). Regulations suggest consideration.	755, 798, 938, 939
Meteorology	frost weathering	Weathering from frost cycles is included in cap degradation modeling.	758, 943
	meteorology	Meteorology is considered indirectly; meteorology as a science is not a FEP, <i>per se</i> , but contributes to other processes, such as precipitation and atmospheric dispersion, which are covered elsewhere. Regulations suggest consideration.	626, 627, 761, 946, 947
	resuspension	Resuspension will affect site performance, allowing particulates from surface soils to be redistributed by atmospheric dispersion.	981
	atmospheric dispersion	Atmospheric dispersion is a potential CT pathway and is modeled. See also: dust devils. Regulations suggest consideration.	256, 528
	tornado	Tornados are possible in the area.	289
Model Settings	model parameterization	Parameterization is a fundamental part of modeling, though is not a FEP, <i>per se</i> .	628
	period of performance	Definition of a period of performance is a fundamental part of PA modeling, though is not a FEP, <i>per se</i> .	629
	regulatory requirements	Regulatory requirements drive much of the modeling in PA, though is not a FEP, <i>per se</i> .	630
	spatial domain	Definition of a spatial domain is a fundamental part of modeling, though is not a FEP, <i>per se</i> .	631

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Superscript

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Table 2 (continued)

Neptune Subgroup	Normalized FEP (accepted)	Discussion	Representative FEP IDs <sup>4</sup>
Other Natural Processes	ecological changes	Changes in the types and abundance of plants and animals could affect performance. Changes in the ecology can be associated with catastrophic events (e.g. fire, inundation), evolution, or climate change.	762, 948, 949
	gas generation	Uranium wastes are expected to produce radon which will affect site performance in terms of doses. See also gas transport.	122, 123, 340, 396, 464, 634, 766, 953, 954
	pedogenesis	Soils are likely to develop on the cap and may affect performance.	765, 952
	radioactive decay and in-growth	Radioactive decay and ingrowth processes are essential to the model.	635, 767, 799, 955
	radon emanation	Radon emanation directly affects the mass of radon released into the environment, and hence site performance.	980
	reconcentration	Possible reconcentration of radiological materials during transport is accounted for in the CT modeling.	127
Tectonic/ Seismic/ Volcanic	geophysical effects	Geophysical changes to the engineered features of the site are accounted for in degradation. Geophysical effects include pressure, stress, density, viscosity, deformation, magnetics, creep, and elasticity.	141, 142, 143, 509, 641, 781, 970, 971

<sup>4</sup> The Representative FEP IDs correspond to the FEP IDs given in Table 1.

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Superscript

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Font: 9 pt

Formatted: Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Font: 9 pt, Superscript

Formatted: Font: 9 pt

**Table 3. List of FEPs dismissed from further consideration.**

Table 3 (continued)			
Neptune Subgroup	Normalized FEP (dismissed)	Discussion	Representative FEP IDs <sup>1</sup>
Celestial	meteorite impact	The occurrence and consequences of a direct hit by a meteorite are out of the scope of this model.	1, 158, 219, 220, 251, 320, 348, 415, 491, 492, 493, 518, 650, 810
Climate change	glacial effects	Glacial effects include presence of continental glaciers and resulting isostatic effects, glacial erosion, and periglacial effects. Glaciers in the basin are not modeled. Return of a large lake is expected should a glacial epoch return and is covered within climate change scenarios.	5, 160, 223, 255, 322, 351, 418, 494, 495, 525, 526, 654, 655, 815, 816
	permafrost	The effects of permafrost are bounded by those of cap degradation, which considers more damaging freeze/thaw cycles. See frost weathering.	6, 300
Contaminant Migration	gas intrusion	No mechanism for intrusion of naturally-produced gases into the repository has been identified.	41, 677, 834
Engineered Features	convergence of openings	This FEP applies to mined repositories only.	837
	design error	Errors in design could compromise performance but are not included in the modeling. Design error is distinct from construction or operational error.	47, 358, 424
	material defects	Material defects are covered by degradation, and include material defects in source containment, closure cap, and other engineered materials.	691, 851
	mechanical effects	Mechanical effects are covered implicitly by degradation, and include changes in mechanical properties and conditions, including failure.	63, 64, 65, 172, 262, 365, 366, 434, 435, 556, 557, 693, 694, 855, 856
	release of stored energy	No significant energy is stored within the wastes.	66, 436, 857
	repository seals	Regulations suggest consideration, but, the sealing of the repository shafts, boreholes, and construction and failure of such is applicable only to mined repositories.	67, 173, 229, 263, 328, 367, 437, 438, 558, 559, 697, 860

Table 3 (continued)

Neptune Subgroup	Normalized FEP (dismissed)	Discussion	Representative FEP IDs <sup>1</sup>
Exposure	agriculture	Agriculture includes establishment, evolution, and abandonment of agriculture and aquaculture at and near the site. Regulations suggest consideration, however, none of these are expected to occur because of the high salinity of soils and groundwater at the site.	705, 803, 878
Geological	diagenesis	Diagenesis in local lacustrine sediments could include the formation of interstitial evaporites, but is not expected to change site performance.	83, 175, 265, 369, 441, 578, 702, 875
	gas or brine pockets	No gas or brine pockets have been identified below the site.	176, 370, 442, 579
	landslide	Regulations suggest consideration, but landslides are not expected to occur in the flat lacustrine basin. Mass wasting of the site itself is covered under erosion.	266, 703, 876
	local subsidence	Geological subsidence in the area is unlikely to seriously affect performance, and is not expected in the basin of lacustrine sediments.	267
Human Processes	accidents during operations	Regulations suggest consideration, but operational performance is not within the scope of the PA model.	84, 704, 877
	climate control	No climate control at the facility is assumed. Climate control is a feature of certain mined repositories.	268, 371
	closure failure	Regulations suggest consideration; however, poor closure includes abandonment or other failure to close the facility as planned, and is not modeled.	86, 87, 707, 708, 880, 881
	fire	The waste is not combustible or explosive. Fires in the waste itself or following explosions are distinct from wildfire.	269, 270
	fisheries	Regulations suggest consideration, but development of fisheries is not credible at the site.	884
	geothermal energy production	No geothermal resources are identified at the site.	89, 711, 885
	injection wells	Given the regional history, the construction of injection wells nearby for disposal of liquid wastes is possible. The effect of drilling such wells in the vicinity would be negligible, however.	232, 715, 889

- Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style
- Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style
- Formatted: Superscript
- Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style
- Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style
- Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style
- Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style
- Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style
- Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style
- Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style
- Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style
- Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style
- Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Table 3 (continued)

Neptune Subgroup	Normalized FEP (dismissed)	Discussion	Representative FEP IDs <sup>1</sup>
	intentional intrusion	Intentional intruders are not protected and are not modeled as receptors. Intentional intrusion includes exhumation of waste, sabotage, terrorism, or archeological research.	96, 180, 181, 278, 376, 377, 447, 448, 717, 808, 891
	investigation	Site investigation is considered intentional, and receptors are not covered.	598, 599, 809
	irrigation	Regulations suggest consideration, and irrigation could affect site performance, but will not occur since there is no suitable water source.	182, 233, 378, 449, 718, 892
	monitoring	Monitoring of the site is required, but persons performing the activity are not protected since it is intentional and informed. Monitoring activities will not affect the performance of the site.	97, 603, 721, 896
	nuclear testing	Regulations suggest consideration; however, testing of nuclear devices underground, at the ground surface, or in the atmosphere is considered intentional disruption of the site and is not covered.	98, 722, 897
	operational effects	Operations could affect performance, and include normal site operation, closure, and later attempts at site improvement. Regulations suggest consideration; however, operations are not part of the PA.	99, 604, 605, 723, 724, 898, 899, 900
	operational error	Covered under operational effects. Operational errors include poor quality site construction, waste emplacement, and site closure. Regulations suggest consideration, however, operations are not part of the PA.	100, 184, 279, 379, 380, 451, 725, 726, 901, 902, 903
	quality control	Quality control is important to site operations, but is not a FEP that lends itself to modeling.	606
	resource extraction	Regulations suggest consideration. Resource extraction is a type of intentional intrusion, including drilling, mining, or quarrying into the repository, or in such a way as to affect performance, in search of resources such as petroleum, natural gas, salt, rock, or geothermal resources. See intentional intrusion.	101, 102, 103, 185, 186, 234, 235, 280, 331, 332, 381, 382, 383, 452, 453, 501, 608, 609, 728, 729, 730, 731, 907, 908, 909, 910
	sabotage	Sabotage is by its nature intentional. See intentional intrusion.	104, 187, 333, 384, 454, 732, 733, 911, 912

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Superscript

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

**Table 3 (continued)**

Neptune Subgroup	Normalized FEP (dismissed)	Discussion	Representative FEP IDs <sup>1</sup>
	unplanned events	This category is too vague to be considered explicitly; unplanned events are generally subsumed by other FEPs.	610
	war	Intrusion or disruption as part of an act of war would be intentional. See intentional intrusion.	105, 188, 334, 385, 455
	waste recovery	Regulations suggest consideration, but waste recovery, retrieval, or mining are considered intentional acts. See intentional intrusion.	106, 189, 386, 456, 607.734, 735
	water resource management	Water resource activities include construction of dams, reservoirs, and wells, and could affect the site as water is extracted or retained. Regulations suggest consideration; however, this is not specifically modeled, as it is bounded by the large lake scenario.	107, 108, 109, 190, 236, 237, 281, 282, 387, 457, 458, 611, 736, 737, 913, 914, 915
	weapons testing	Any nuclear and conventional weapons testing would be done with cognizance of the site, and is intentional. See also explosions and intentional intrusion.	191, 283, 459
Hydrogeological	subsrosion	No subsurface erosion has been reported in the vicinity.	925
Hydrology	flooding	Regulations suggest consideration; however, temporary flooding of the site due to extreme precipitation is not plausible due to site topography in the midst of the flats. This is distinct from inundation by the return of a large lake, which is included.	194, 240, 391, 462, 746, 926, 927, 928
	surface water transport	Surface water transport includes formation and changes in rivers, lakes, and streams, and transport of dissolved and suspended solids, and sediments. Such effects are not anticipated at the facility. This is distinct from inundation by the return of a large lake, which is included.	119, 241, 287, 317, 318, 319, 394, 395, 625, 756, 757, 940, 941
Marine	coastal processes	Coastal processes will not apply at the site, since no sea or ocean is expected in relevant time frames. However, see wave action.	612, 738, 760, 916, 945
	hurricanes	No hurricanes occur in the area.	242, 288
	insolation	Insolation (the amount of sunshine on the site) has no direct effect on site performance. See ecological changes.	759, 944

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Superscript

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Table 3 (continued)

Neptune Subgroup	Normalized FEP (dismissed)	Discussion	Representative FEP IDs <sup>1</sup>
	marine effects	Marine processes will not apply at the site, since no sea or ocean is expected in relevant time frames. Marine processes include sea-level change. See also coastal processes and tsunami.	620, 745
	tsunami	No tsunami will occur at the site. See coastal processes and marine effects.	243
Natural Processes	microbial effects	Microbial action is not expected to affect performance. Microbial processes include corrosion, changes in chemistry, and dissolution of glasses, but biotically-induced transport is limited to macrobiological processes.	120, 632, 633, 763, 764, 950, 951
	radiological effects	Regulations suggest consideration. Radiological processes such as radiolysis are a concern for waste containment in some geological repositories, but are not modeled here, since waste containment is not given credit.	124, 125, 126, 195, 341, 397, 465, 466, 636, 768, 769, 956, 957
	wildfire	Occasional wildfire (brush fire, forest fire, either local or widespread) is not likely to affect site performance in the long run, since this is a natural part of plant community dynamics.	290
Source Release	electrochemical effects	Electrochemical effects are not a relevant process at the site. Electrochemical reactions are a concern for the SKB repository.	121
	explosions	Explosive gases are not present in the repository.	88
Tectonic/ Seismic/ Volcanic	breccia pipes	Regulations suggest consideration, and the formation of breccia pipes or mud volcanoes could affect performance, but is considered highly unlikely.	197, 343, 399, 469
	diapirism	Salt deposits in the strata below the site will not result in the formation of diapirs.	198, 244, 292, 344, 400, 470, 638, 776, 965
	discontinuities	No major geological discontinuities are envisioned at the site.	639
	earthquake	Earthquakes, either from natural or man-made causes, would not change the performance of this shallow unconsolidated site.	138, 293

- Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style
- Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style
- Formatted: Superscript
- Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style
- Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style
- Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style
- Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style
- Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style
- Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style
- Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style
- Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style
- Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style
- Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style
- Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style
- Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Table 3 (continued)

Neptune Subgroup	Normalized FEP (dismissed)	Discussion	Representative FEP IDs <sup>1</sup>
faulting		Faulting is unlikely to significantly affect performance of this shallow unconsolidated site and is not explicitly modeled. Geologic faulting includes all type of faults, shear zones, diastrophism, existing and future. See also see fracturing.	139, 199, 200, 201, 245, 294, 345, 401, 402, 471, 472, 473, 506, 507, 508, 777, 778, 966, 967
fracturing		Tectonic fracturing will not affect unconsolidated site performance.	202, 203, 204, 205, 246, 403, 474, 475, 476, 477, 779, 968
geological intrusion		Magmatic and intrusive igneous activity has not been identified in the vicinity of the site. Geological intrusion includes dikes, intrusive and magmatic activity, and metamorphism due to such activity. This is distinct from breccia pipes (mud volcanoes) and human intrusion.	140, 206, 207, 295, 346, 404, 405, 478, 479, 640, 780, 969
hydraulic fracturing		Hydraulic fracturing is performed in solid rock, and has no applicaton at the site. Hydraulic fracturing ("hydrofracking") is induced by humans to enhance resource recovery or liquid waste disposal by injection.	208, 480
intrusion into accumulation zone in the biosphere		No accumulation zone in the biosphere has been identified at the site.	144
isostatic effects		Isostatic changes could influence lake levels, which are accounted for elsewhere. Isostasy includes that caused by tectonics, large bodies of water, and by continental glaciers.	209, 406, 481, 510, 511
lava tubes		No lava tubes exist at the site or are expected in the future.	210, 407, 482
orogeny		No significant orogeny is expected in relevant time frames. Orogeny (mountain-building) caused by tectonic movements or regional uplift.	211, 247, 296, 408, 483
regional subsidence		Regional subsidence could influence lake levels, which are accounted for elsewhere.	145, 409, 782, 972
seismic effects		Regulations suggest consideration, but effects of seismic activity (see also earthquakes) would be insignificant for shallow land burial.	248, 512, 513, 642, 783, 973

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Superscript

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Table 3 (continued)

Neptune Subgroup	Normalized FEP (dismissed)	Discussion	Representative FEP IDs <sup>1</sup>
	tectonic effects	Tectonic effects could influence lake levels, which are accounted for elsewhere.	146, 147, 148, 149, 212, 213, 410, 484, 643, 644, 784, 785, 974, 975, 976
	volcanism	No significant volcanism is expected in relevant time frames.	150, 214, 249, 250, 411, 412, 485, 486, 514, 515, 516, 645, 786, 800, 977
Waste	nuclear criticality	Nuclear criticality, while a concern for repositories of used nuclear fuel, is not a concern at this LLW site.	151, 152, 215, 297, 347, 413, 487, 646, 787, 978
	other waste	The current analysis is constrained to examine depleted uranium wastes only, including associated "contaminant" waste. This rather vague reference to "other waste" will be addressed as the scope of wastes under consideration expands.	153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 216, 217, 218, 298, 299, 414, 488, 489, 490, 788, 979

<sup>1</sup>The Representative FEP IDs correspond to the FEP IDs given in Table 1.

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Superscript

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Superscript

Formatted: Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style